

REMARKS / DISCUSSION OF ISSUES

Claims 1-22 are pending in the application; claims 21 and 22 are newly added.

The applicants thank the Examiner for acknowledging the claim for priority and receipt of certified copies of all the priority document(s), and for notifying the applicants that the drawings are accepted.

The Office action objects to the addition of claim 20 in the applicants' prior amendment. Claim 20 claims a dielectric layer with a dielectric constant that is less than five. The applicants respectfully maintain that this claim adds no new matter to the specification as filed. The applicants point out that conventional displays have a dielectric constant between 8 and 9 (page 2, lines 1-4), and that a powder layer having a low dielectric constant is provided to reduce the discharge capacitance (page 2, lines 14-15). The applicants also note that a dielectric constant of 4.6 is relatively low (page 3, lines 2-3). The applicants also provide the equation for determining the dielectric constant (page 2, line 23), and note herein that if the parameters of the equation are given values corresponding to the example embodiments, such as SiO<sub>2</sub> powder at 60% volume, the resultant dielectric constant will be substantially less than five.

The Office action rejects claims 1-4 and 6-20 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) over Shinohara (USP 5,701,056). The applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Shinohara does not teach a plasma picture screen that includes a front plate on which a dielectric layer having a first dielectric constant is provided, and a powder layer having a second dielectric constant that is substantially less than the first dielectric constant, thereby reducing a discharge capacitance of the plasma cells, as claimed in claim 1, upon which claims 2-10 and 22 depend.

In like manner, Shinohara does not teach a plasma display that includes a front plate on which is provided a first dielectric layer having a first dielectric constant and a second dielectric layer having a second dielectric constant that is substantially lower than the first dielectric constant, thereby reducing a capacitance between

electrode arrays on the front plate and electrode arrays on a carrier plate, as taught in claim 11, upon which claims 12-21 depend.

Shinohara is silent with regard to the dielectric constants of either the dielectric layer 2, or the partition wall 5, and thus cannot be said to teach the elements of claims 1 or 11. Accordingly, the rejection of claims 1-4 and 6-20 under 102(b) over Shinohara should be withdrawn.

Additionally, Shinohara fails to teach a powder layer that includes a material chosen from the group of dielectric materials and phosphors, as claimed in claim 6, a powder layer that includes material that reflects UV radiation, as claimed in claim 8, a powder layer that includes material that emits UV radiation, as claimed in claim 9, and a powder layer that includes a plurality of materials that each emit a different color of visible light, as claimed in claim 10. Similarly, Shinohara fails to teach a dielectric layer that includes a material that reflects UV radiation, as claimed in claim 16, a dielectric layer that includes a material that emits UV radiation, as claimed in claim 17, a dielectric layer that includes a material that emits visible light, as claimed in claim 18, and a dielectric layer includes a first material that emits light of a first color and a second material that emits light of a second color, as claimed in claim 19.

Shinohara teaches that the partition layer 5 are black-colored, and configured to absorb light (column 8, lines 37-50). Accordingly, the rejection of claims 6, 8-10, and 16-19 under 102(b) over Shinohara should be withdrawn.

The Office action rejects claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Shinohara and Takagi (JP 2000-113824). The applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 5 is dependent upon claim 1, and in this rejection, the Office action relies upon Shinohara for teaching the elements of claim 1. As noted above, Shinohara does not teach the elements of claim 1, and therefore the rejection of claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) should be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, the applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the objection(s) and/or rejection(s) of record, allow all the pending claims, and find the application in condition for allowance. If any points remain in issue that may best be resolved through a personal or telephonic interview, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Robert M. McDermott/  
Robert M. McDermott, Esq.  
Reg. 41,508  
804-493-0707

**Please direct all correspondence to:**  
Corporate Counsel  
U.S. PHILIPS CORPORATION  
P.O. Box 3001  
Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510-8001